



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

exclusively to a study of English trade administration. Can it be successfully maintained that the otherwise clean-cut study of the trade of a particular district is not interrupted by such an elaborated study of legislation so appropriate in a book confined to a general treatment of trade administration?

The last chapter on the effect of the British legislation, though well done, covers colonial trade in general and often loses for the reader any clear view of the Delaware district. The chapter might very properly be included in a general study on British trade administration. Evidently an elimination of part of this material, which takes one too far afield, would enable the writer to impress the reader more convincingly of her conclusion that the legislation was economically untenable for the Delaware district.

There can be no questioning the fact that the author has very thoroughly and profitably studied widely in the public record office, the British museum, the house of lords, Bodleian library, All Soul's college, and in the Pennsylvania historical society library, as her well-arranged bibliography attests.

R. B. WAY

*Revolution in Virginia.* By H. J. Eckenrode, Ph. D., associate professor of economics and history, Richmond college. (Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin company, 1916. 311 p. \$2.00 net)

Because the historians of the revolution have chosen to center their narratives around the deliberations of the continental congress and the campaigns of the continental army such important phases of the general movement as the development of the revolutionary spirit within the several colonies and the creation of the new American states have not been accorded their proper emphasis. This volume, as the title indicates, is an attempt to remedy the defect, in part at least, by an examination of the events connected with the birth and progress of the revolution in the most populous and possibly the most conservative of the English colonies in America.

Owing to the fact that New Englanders were convinced that the revenue policy of the British government was threatening the life of their local industries and interfering with the prosperity of their merchants, the revolution in these colonies was primarily economic in character and was dominated by the middle class. In Virginia, on the other hand, it was almost entirely political in origin and although in time the great body of the people came to be involved, the local gentry and not the political demagogues shaped its course.

Manifestations of Virginia's independent, self-reliant spirit which

were already noticeable before 1700 came to be much more clearly defined in the following century as a result of the rapid increase in the wealth, population, and culture of the colony. Not, however, until the upland counties had gained materially in political strength and, under the leadership of Patrick Henry, had begun to exert an influence in the house of burgesses far more radical than that wielded by the more cautious leaders of the tidewater communities, did the smoldering spirit of independence show itself in the form of open defiance of parliamentary control. From this date, 1765, there were two more or less clearly defined parties in Virginia: the conservatives, headed by the old leaders, and the democrats or progressives led by Patrick Henry and Richard Henry Lee. Even though party names did not exist there was, nevertheless, true party action; and the opponents, although agreeing in the main on constitutional matters, were at variance as to the ways and means of attaining the ends sought. Accordingly as one faction or the other was in power the revolution either lagged or went forward rapidly. Moreover, as a consequence of this alignment into political parties a revolution developed within the greater movement. First, there was the general opposition to the spread of English imperialism in which Virginia joined with the other colonies; and, second, an internal upheaval directed against the existing social organization. This local movement resulted in the formation of the democratic party which was to spread beyond the confines of the commonwealth and ultimately to raise Jefferson to the presidency.

When the house of burgesses, after having been dissolved by Governor Dunmore, came together informally and provided for the calling of a convention to meet at Williamsburg, the revolution actually began in Virginia. The convention, which in reality was only a legislative body, proceeded in August, 1775, to create an executive, openly revolutionary in character, and to endow this committee of safety with power to levy and equip troops, gather munitions of war, and to enter negotiations with other colonies for military support, thereby committing Virginia irrevocably to participation in the armed resistance which had already begun in the northern colonies.

The planter class entered the struggle reluctantly and with no thought of separation from England. Many of these tidewater gentlemen, although watchfully jealous of their rights as Englishmen, were at the same time proud of their Anglican connections and sought to retain these by exerting upon the mother country economic pressure of sufficient weight to convince her statesmen of the folly of any attempt to tighten the bonds of imperialism in America. To this end the continental association founded upon the doctrine of non-intercourse had been formed and given a trial. When this measure failed to give re-

lief and separation was known to be inevitable the internal revolution developed. The conservative planters who had not been inclined to welcome independence, or even war, because in these events they saw the failure of their own particular form of resistance, at last became partially reconciled to the situation and went forward in the hope that separation might be effected without involving the destruction of the framework of colonial institutions either social or political. That is, they hoped to retain their old position of leadership with the additional advantage of being relieved of English interference in governmental affairs. To another class in Virginia, — the poor people, — the revolution meant more than mere resistance to England. It awakened a spirit of antagonism against the whole social and political order and fostered the hope that in revolution there might be a reorganization of society within the colony which would accord them a larger share in the government and a higher standard of comfort as well. The participation of this class in the movement marks the end of the period which was characterized by a conservative attempt to abate English encroachments upon colonial liberty.

After independence came the formulation of the state constitution and the formation of the state, — just at the time when the progressive group was in the ascendancy. Patrick Henry, an ardent democrat and a political agitator without a peer, was the first governor. He was followed by Jefferson in 1779, when Virginia assumed all the characteristics of a permanent democratic state. As a governor Jefferson was a failure. He went into office a popular leader but because of a combination of unfortunate conditions and unexpected events over which he may possibly have had no control, he experienced a most unsatisfactory administration and in the end narrowly escaped impeachment. Peace did much to settle the widespread unrest which prevailed but it also brought into bolder relief the question of continuing the experiment in democracy which the new state had entered upon. The conservatives had long awaited the time when they could make a successful attack upon the democrats. Favorable opportunities might appear either when their opponents should be discredited politically in the eyes of the people, or when the war, so subversive of social distinctions, had ceased. The failure of the Jefferson administration afforded one opportunity; the coming of peace, another. Full advantage was taken of neither and in the years immediately following democratic social and political ideals prevailed.

The military operations of the revolution as they affected Virginia are given adequate treatment as is the turmoil caused by the increased activities of the tories towards the close of the war. But the main thread of the narrative is devoted to the development of the internal revolution

which was so significant during these years of Virginia's history.

The book is an exceptionally good one; it is well written and interesting; it furnishes abundant evidence of careful study; it is a contribution to the literature of the revolution; and at no time does the reader get the impression that it is the result of mere mental gymnastics. The lack of a bibliography is a disappointment for aside from the few footnotes which show the sources of some of the materials used we are given only the author's statement that "the present work is chiefly based on the original sources of information in the archives of the Virginia State Library."

WILLIAM V. POOLEY

*Georgia as a proprietary province.* The execution of a trust. By James Ross McCain, Ph.D., professor of American history, Agnes Scott College. (Boston: Richard G. Badger, 1917. 357 p. \$2.50 net)

Several years ago the earlier chapters of this study were privately printed by the author for presentation to Columbia university as a doctoral dissertation, the work having been done under the guidance of Professor Osgood. Those chapters are here revised and five new chapters added, so that the present volume is practically new. The ground covered by Mr. McCain has already been worked by earlier Georgia historians, notably by William B. Stevens and Charles C. Jones. Both these writers were excellent historians, but neither had at hand the materials used by Mr. McCain, and, furthermore, it was time for a new interpretation, since Stevens and Jones wrote, respectively, sixty and thirty-five years ago.

Mr. McCain makes no attempt to trace in detail the current of events in the proprietary period of Georgia. His purpose is rather to picture the workings of the corporation or trust as an organizing and administrative body. Hence he discusses at length the personnel of the board, evaluating their respective services to the colony; recounts their political activities, made necessary by the relation of the trustees to the government of the British empire; describes the creation and activities of the "common council," a sort of committee within the general corporation, and distinguishes the functions of the two bodies; makes plain the struggle to keep clear of the board of trade, which was busily extending its control over the colonies; discusses fully the legislation of the trustees for the colony; and gives interesting details of the task of finding financial support for the venture. An excellent chapter handles the relations of Oglethorpe to the trustees and to the administration of affairs in Georgia — the only critical estimate we have of Oglethorpe. His status is shown to have been, throughout his connection with the colony,